

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

EDWARD SANCHEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

H023219

(Santa Clara County  
Super. Ct. No. CC066636)

Defendant Edward Sanchez was charged by an amended information with driving under the influence of alcohol and drugs causing injury (Veh. Code, § 23153, subd. (a)), felony driving with a blood alcohol level of .08 while causing injury (Veh. Code § 23153, subd. (b)), two felony counts of driving under the influence of alcohol with a felony prior (Veh. Code, §§ 23152, 23550.5, subd. (a)), and a misdemeanor count of being under the influence of drugs (Health & Saf. Code, § 11550, subd. (a)). It was further alleged that in committing these crimes he personally inflicted great bodily injury (Pen. Code, § 12022.7). One “strike” prior (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subd. (b)-(i), 1170.12), a serious felony prior (Pen. Code, § 667, subd. (a)) and two “prison ” priors (Pen. Code, § 667.5, subd. (b)) completed the allegations.

During the pendency of this matter the defendant made two motions to have different counsel appointed. (*People v. Marsden* (1970) 2 Cal.3d. 118) Both motions were denied.

Defendant ultimately pleaded guilty to all charges and admitted all enhancements and priors with the understanding that he would receive a sentence of no more than 14 years in state prison. The court imposed a 13-year prison sentence. We appointed counsel to represent defendant in this court.

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief which states the case and the facts. Counsel raises one issue for consideration by this court during its independent review of the record, specifically, did the trial court err in denying Sanchez's repeated *Marsden* motions? We notified defendant of his right to submit written argument in his own behalf within 30 days.

Defendant has submitted a five page, handwritten letter to the court in which he reasserts many of the arguments raised in support of his *Marsden* motions. He further argues that the injuries suffered by the passengers in his vehicle resulted from their failure to wear seatbelts rather than his act of driving under the influence.

Pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, we have reviewed the entire record, including the *Marsden* motions, and have concluded that there is no arguable issue on appeal.

The judgment is affirmed.

---

O'FARRELL, J.\*

WE CONCUR:

---

BAMATTRE-MANOUKIAN, ACTING P.J.

---

WUNDERLICH, J.

---

\* Judge of the Monterey Superior Court assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.